



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,728	07/29/2005	Michel Lefebvre	1512-64	8346
24106	7590	10/02/2007		
EGBERT LAW OFFICES 412 MAIN STREET, 7TH FLOOR HOUSTON, TX 77002			EXAMINER DEBROW, JAMES J	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/524,728	Applicant(s) LEFEBVRE, MICHEL	
	Examiner James J. Debrow	Art Unit 2176	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 February 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: Application filed 16 Feb. 2005.
2. Claims 1-10 are pending in this case. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

### *Drawings*

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show “**step 800**” as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "802" has been used to designate both "Definition of a standard" and "Selection of a standard". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Art Unit: 2176

6. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains legal phraseology "said" and "for a example", which can be implied as "such as". Further, the abstract exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Regarding the preamble of **claim 1**, the phrase "for example" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

9. **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim recites the term "noteworthy". It is unclear to the Examiner as to the meaning/scope of the term in this context. <sup>For</sup> The purpose of prior art rejection, the examiner interpretes "noteworthy information" to mean any information which is of interest to the user. C993

10. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim recites "traditional ergonomics". It is unclear to the Examiner as to the meaning/scope of the term "traditional" in this context. <sup>For</sup> The purpose C993

Art Unit: 2176

of prior art rejection, the examiner interpretes "*traditional ergonomics*" to mean a single linear line of text.

11. **Claims 4-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 4-10 are in improper form because a multiple dependent claims cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claims, which raises issues of insufficient antecedent basis and a scope that can not be defined, thus rendering the claims indefinite. <sup>for</sup> The purpose of prior art rejection, the examiner will interpret claims as being as being defined within the scope of "using a search engine to locate web pages as specified by the user via a GUI."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCaskey et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0152245 A1; Filed Apr. 5, 2001) (hereinafter 'McCaskey') in view of Dedrick (Patent No.: 5,717,923; Filed: Nov. 3, 1994).**

**In regards to independent claim 1**, McCaskey discloses *a method for communicating structured information, for example, a report or statement, between a first user and at least one second user, characterized in that it consists of:*

- *a step for defining a document standard (800), which determines the general framework of the document in the form of a series of titles and/or conventional notifications and values authorized by certain fields of noteworthy information (0083-0087; McCaskey discloses web page templates with specialized formats customized for specific news categories, thus defining a document standard.).*

- *a step for inputting (808), by the first user, information to be provided incorporating a step for inputting text and/or titles as a supplement to the general framework and/or a step for selecting values on the noteworthy fields (0064; 0120; McCaskey discloses writers use software to direct story's placement and formatting in it's printed newspaper form. Thus a step for inputting information.).*

- *a step for transmitting (814) the information of the document from the first user to the destination of each secondary user (0133; claim 58; McCaskey discloses transmitting the edited news electronic web page to the web user.).*

McCaskey does not expressly teach *a step for selecting (822), by each secondary user, a sorting criterion based on the titles or the noteworthy fields;*

- *a step for re-organization (824) of the document according to the selected criteria; and*

Art Unit: 2176

- a step for supplying (826) to the secondary user the document re-organized according to the criterion.

Dedrick teaches a step for selecting (822), by each secondary user, a sorting criterion based on the titles or the noteworthy fields (col. 8, lines 20-55; Dedrick teaches the end user (*first user*) requesting a web page sorted by a particular item (*title*), i.e. camera, modifying the user profile data. The appraisal agent accesses the user profile data from the personal profile database to determine the search criteria, then search for information by making requests to the yellow page servers (*second user*). ).

- a step for re-organization (824) of the document according to the selected criteria (col. 8, lines 20-55; Dedrick teaches the end user requesting a web page sorted by a particular item (*title*), i.e. camera, modifying the user profile data. Therefore teaching a step for the re-organization of the document according to the selected criteria.).

- a step for supplying (826) to the secondary user the document re-organized according to the criterion (col. 8, lines 20-55; Dedrick teaches the end user (*first user*) requesting a web page sorted by a particular item (*title*), i.e. camera, modifying the user profile data. The appraisal agent accesses the user profile data from the personal profile database to determine the search criteria, then search for information by making requests to the yellow page servers (*second user*). The advertisement is returned to the end user.).



Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine McCaskey with Dedrick for the benefit of the publishers and advertisers to be able to provide the type of electronic information that end users want, thereby providing high quality electronic information (col. 17, lines 10-12).

**In regards to dependent claim 2,** McCaskey discloses *a method according to claim 1, characterized in that during the step for inputting and/or during the step for supplying, in at least one text zone, the titles defined by the standard and the text input by the user appear, like a single linear text relating to the traditional ergonomics of text processing* (0091; Fig. 4; McCaskey discloses the web page template which contain text zone which holds text which is *traditional ergonomically* displayed as a single line of text, ie captions, titles, headlines, archives, classifies, etc..).

**In regards to dependent claim 3,** McCaskey does not expressly disclose *a method according to any one of the claims 1 or 2, characterized in that during the step for defining the standard, for at least one title, a selection step is made if the title can be modified by the first user during the inputting step.*

However Dedrick teaches *a method according to any one of the claims 1 or 2, characterized in that during the step for defining the standard, for at least one title, a selection step is made if the title can be modified by the first user during the inputting step* (col. 8, lines 20-45; Dedrick teaches the end user (*first user*) requesting a web

Art Unit: 2176

page sorted by a particular item (*title*), i.e. camera, modifying the user profile data for at least one title.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine McCaskey with Dedrick for the benefit of the publishers and advertisers to be able to provide the type of electronic information that end users want, thereby providing high quality electronic information (col. 17, lines 10-12).

**In regards to dependent claim 4, McCaskey discloses a method according to any one of the claims 1 to 3, characterized in that during the step for inputting of the information, the first user can modify at least one part of the standard defined during the step for definition of the standard (0086; McCaskey shows the layouts of the templates as they might appear on a computer screen. The contents and behaviors of any region of the template may be easily modified by changes to the template itself.).**

14. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

**15. Claims 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCaskey in view of Dedrick further in view of Miyasaka et al. (Patent No.: US 6,766,362 B1; Filed: Jul. 28, 2000) (hereinafter 'Miyasaka').**

**In regards to dependent claim 5,** McCaskey in view Dedrick does not expressly disclose *a method according to any one of the claims 1 to 4, characterized in that during the step for defining the standard, categories of information are defined and, during the selection step, one can select a hierarchy of information values depending on the categories.*

Miyasaka teaches *a method according to any one of the claims 1 to 4, characterized in that during the step for defining the standard, categories of information are defined and, during the selection step, one can select a hierarchy of information values depending on the categories* (col. 6, lines 11-col. 7, line 21; Fig. 6A; Miyasaka teaches a hierarchical structure of categories which conforms to searching and indexing requirements of contents stored in content databases.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine McCaskey and Dedrick with Miyasaka for the benefit of providing a computer-network having content that can be selected and presented in a form according to personal preference of an individual recipient (col. 1, lines 60-63).

**In regards to dependent claim 6,** McCaskey in view Dedrick does not expressly disclose *a method according to any one of the claims 1 to 5, characterized in that during*

*the step for inputting of the information, a priority level is associated with the information input, and, during the selection step, one can select a hierarchy of information values depending on the priorities.*

Miyasaka teaches *a priority level is associated with the information input, and, during the selection step, one can select a hierarchy of information values depending on the priorities* (col. 6, lines 11-col. 7, line 57; col. 8, lines 55-64; col. 14, lines 54-65; Miyasaka teaches a hierarchical structure of categories which conforms to searching and indexing requirements of contents stored in content databases. Miyasaka also teaches document content/area have priority levels as well as modifying the relative priority of topics and subtopics.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine McCaskey and Dedrick with Miyasaka for the benefit of providing a computer-network having content that can be selected and presented in a form according to personal preference of an individual recipient (col. 1, lines 60-63).

**In regards to dependent claim 7,** McCaskey discloses *a method according to any one of the claims 1 to 6, characterized in that during the step for transmission, the information of the document is transmitted according to an accessible page format over an information network, readable using a web navigator and printable from any office work station equipped with a web navigator and a printer* (0133; claim 58; McCaskey discloses transmitting the edited news electronic web page to the web user.).

**In regards to dependent claim 8,** McCaskey discloses *a method according to any one of the claims 1 to 7, characterized in that it comprises a step for consolidation of documents, during which the information of the documents which are linked to the same titles are juxtaposed under a unique title into the different documents to be consolidated* (0066-0079; McCaskey discloses an editorial database, which is a rational database residing on a maintenance Web server system. McCaskey further discloses the editorial database is made up of a set of interrelated tables. It has been established and it well known in the art at that rational databases can be display information as a consolidation of documents, during which the information of the documents which are linked to the same titles are juxtaposed under a unique title into the different documents to be consolidated.).

**In regards to dependent claim 9,** McCaskey does not expressly disclose a *method according to any one of the claims 1 to 8, characterized in that it comprises a step for determining a summary of the document, during which information is selected as a function of a hierarchy of information values.*

Dedrick teaches *a summary of the document* (col. 13, lines 36-39; col. 15, lines 26-27; Dedrick teaches the publisher may include content titles that summarily describe the content and are stored in the index databases.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine McCaskey with Dedrick for the benefit of the

Art Unit: 2176

publishers and advertisers to be able to provide the type of electronic information that end users want, thereby providing high quality electronic information (col. 17, lines 10-12).

Miyasaka teaches *information is selected as a function of a hierarchy of information values* (col. 6, lines 11-col. 7, line 21; Fig. 6A; Miyasaka teaches a hierarchical structure of categories which conforms to searching and indexing requirements of contents stored in content databases.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine McCaskey and Dedrick with Miyasaka for the benefit of providing a computer-network having content that can be selected and presented in a form according to personal preference of an individual recipient (col. 1, lines 60-63).

**In regards to dependent claim 10,** McCaskey in view Dedrick does not expressly disclose *a method according to any one of the claims 1 to 9, characterized in that during the step for inputting information, an identification of the author of the information input is allocated, and during the selection step, one can select a hierarchy of information values depending on the identifications.*

Miyasaka teaches *according to any one of the claims 1 to 9, characterized in that during the step for inputting information, an identification of the author of the information input is allocated, and during the selection step, one can select a hierarchy of information values depending on the identifications* (col. 4, line 26-col. 7, line 21;

Art Unit: 2176

Miyasaka teaches registering individual users information in a profile database.

Miyasaka teaches a hierarchical structure of categories, which conforms to searching and indexing requirements of contents stored in content databases.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine McCaskey and Dedrick with Miyasaka for the benefit of providing a computer-network having content that can be selected and presented in a form according to personal preference of an individual recipient (col. 1, lines 60-63).

16. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2176

*William L. Bashore*  
WILLIAM BASHORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER